

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-22 are currently pending.

Applicants note that the drawings are objected as Figure 4 has a misspelled word. Applicants file a replacement sheet correcting the spelling of Authentication in Figure 4.

Claims 1, 4, 7 and 17 are objected because they contain certain informalities. Applicants have amended each of these claims in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Applicants request that these objections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for lacking antecedent bases for certain terms, such as contact alias, mobile unit and compressed message. Applicant has amended claims, 1, 9 and 17 to provide the proper antecedent basis for each term as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants request that the claims are in the proper format and request that this rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

According to the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0120813 A1 to Majumdar et al. and further in view of United States Patent No. 7,003,282 to Ekberg. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9 and 17 to address the rejection. In particular, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9 and 17 to indicate that the at least one signaling message is for a session that is directed to a mobile unit. In addition, the claims have been amended to determine whether there is a need to route a message corresponding to the least one later message to the mobile unit. When it is determine that there is a need, the at least one later signaling message to the mobile unit is compressed and routed to the mobile unit. If there is no need to send the message, a second message that corresponds to the signaling message is not sent to the mobile unit.

According to the amendment to the independent claims, the first and second signaling messages belong to the same session. In addition, a step to determine whether a message corresponding to the at least one later message is added and the outcomes of that determination such that a message is compressed and sent when it is determined that

a message is to be sent a no second message is sent but a response to the signaling message is made when there is no need. In an embodiment, the at least one signaling message is an SIP message that is then compressed and an SIP response message is sent when no need to route a message is determined. In addition, a controller is used to determine if the message is needed and compresses the signaling message.

The AAPA and Majumdar were discussed in the Amendment filed on May 6, 2006. Ekberg is alleged to disclose sending a second message corresponding to the at least one later message to the mobile unit, generating a response message in response to receiving the at least one later message and sending the response message to the server. Ekberg is directed authentication to be performed in a telecommunications network. The subscriber's authentication information containing at least a challenge and a response is fetched from the mobile communication system to an IP network and authentication is carried out based on the authentication information obtained from the mobile communication system by transmitting a challenge through the IP network to the terminal, by generating a response from the challenge to the terminal's identity module and by comparing the response with the response received from the mobile communication system. Ekberg does not teach the added determining step and the alternatives of forwarding a compressed message or responding to the need for the signaling message based on the outcome of the determination. In addition, Ekberg does not specify that the signaling messages belong to the same session as required by the claims.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of AAPA, Majumdar and Ekberg does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the invention as found in independent claims 1, 9 and 17. It is therefore respectfully submitted that these claims are not obvious in view of cited prior art. As claims 2-6 and 8 depend on claim 1, claims 10-13 and 15-16 depend upon claim 9 and claims 18-22 depend upon claim 17 and include the limitations found in those claims, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references also do not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the contents of the dependent claims. Applicants therefore request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Majumdar and Ekberg and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0215766 A1 to Haddad. Like the other cited prior art, Haddad does not disclose teach or otherwise suggest that the messages are a part of the same session, the determining step and the different alternatives based on the outcome of the determination. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 14 are not obvious in light of the combination of references for the reasons given above. It is requested that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to **50-2117**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorenbosch, Jhereon P. et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 37,585  
Telephone: 847-576-4234  
Fax: 847-576-3750